

Experiments on Human Beings.

VIVISECTION UP TO DATE.

By R. E. DUDGEON, M.D.

"A human life is nothing compared with a new fact in science. . . . The aim of science is the advancement of human knowledge at any sacrifice of human life. . . . If cats and guinea pigs can be put to any higher use than to advance science, we do not know what it is. We do not know of any higher use we can put a man to."

(Prof. Slossom, in the "NEW YORK INDEPENDENT," Dec. 12th, 1895.)

THE only plausible justification or excuse for painful experiments on animals is that thereby we may acquire knowledge that shall enable us to allay the sufferings and save the lives of human beings, and this is the reason we constantly hear given by the apologists of vivisection. By this term I mean all painful experiments on animals ostensibly for scientific objects. But as no advantage to sick and suffering mankind has ever resulted from the countless tortures that have been inflicted on the brute creation by experimental physiologists, this apology for vivisection is untenable. It must be confessed that the vivisectors themselves who, though mainly doctors, are seldom occupied with medical practice, do not perform their experiments from any idea that these can be of use to medicine. They are prompted to engage in this cruel pursuit by what has been happily denominated "scientific curiosity." That the majority of medical men, though few of them have ever performed or even witnessed the vivisection of animals, are advocates of experiments on animals is undoubtedly true; but the reason is that they are persuaded by able editors and authors of medical works and periodicals that such experiments are or may be useful for the cure of

MO-PAM
QY 50
1912
D84e

(4)

diseases which have hitherto resisted the established methods of treatment. There is, however, an ever increasing number, though still a minority of medical practitioners, who have studied the subject and agree with the conclusion of Mr. Lawson Tait, that "Vivisection as a method of research has constantly led those who have employed it into altogether erroneous conclusions, and the records teem with instances in which not only have animals been fruitlessly sacrificed, but human lives have been added to the list of victims by reason of its false light." (*On the Uselessness of Vivisection upon Animals*, by Lawson Tait, F.R.C.S., p. 126).

In Shakespeare's play of "Cymbeline" it is a doctor who opposes the queen's proposal to make experiments on animals with poisons.

"Your highness
Shall from this practice but make hard your heart;
Besides the seeing these effects will be
Both noisome and infectious."

That Dr. Cornelius was right in supposing that this method of research would harden the heart, is evident from the ever increasing cruelty shown in the ingenious tortures to which the victims of the vivisectors are subjected.

Who Originated Modern Vivisection?

It may not be generally known, but it is a fact, that the originator of the modern practice of vivisection, was not a medical man, but, strange to say, a clergyman. In 1733, when no one was thinking of vivisection, which had fallen into merited oblivion for a long period, the Rev. Stephen Hales, B.D., F.R.S., Rector of Farringdon, Hants, and minister of Teddington, Middlesex, therefore a pluralist, published a book entitled, *Statistical Essays*, the second vol. of which contains *Hæmostatics, or an account of some Hydraulic and Hydrostatical Experiments made on the blood and Blood-vessels of Animals*. In this he gives a detailed account of numerous experiments he made on horses, deer, sheep, and other animals, in order to show how

22501568229



the force of the pumping action of the heart decreased as the blood was withdrawn from the circulation. He opened a main artery and inserted in it a long glass tube, and showed how high the blood rose in the tube at each pulsation, and how the blood column decreased in height as the blood was abstracted ounce by ounce until the animal died exhausted and exsanguined. His experiments, though performed more than 160 years ago, were quite of a piece with those of the most modern professors of the art of vivisection—they were utterly useless and horribly cruel. In another respect they also resembled the vivisections of to-day—they obtained the approbation of the Royal Society, and were published in the Transactions of that august body, and their author was elected a Fellow of the Society. It is well known that the surest, I might almost say the only, passport of a doctor to the Fellowship of the Royal Society is that he has perpetrated a great number of vivisections in the pursuit of science. That his experiments have been utterly valueless as far as the health or life of human beings is concerned, is of no consequence to the bestowers of the much coveted Fellowship of our most illustrious scientific society.

Animal Experiments Futile.

The example of the reverend vivisector was not extensively followed for many years. Possibly doctors scorned to be taught by a mere clergyman. But the latter half of this expiring century has witnessed a great revival of experimental research, and with the discovery—or shall I say theory—of the microbic origin of many, especially infectious, diseases, the rage for experiments on animals has attained hitherto unknown dimensions.

But the inutility of experiments on animals, even by the confessions of some of the most industrious vivisectors, *e.g.*, Claude Bernard, who admitted “without doubt our hands are empty of good results,” led some adventurous spirits to look out for more promising

subjects for their investigations. As the poet says, "the proper study of mankind is man," so our ardent researchers thought that the proper subject for experiments, designed to unveil the hidden mysteries of human nature, should be human beings themselves. With experiments on so-called "dumb" animals it was a case of "great cry and little wool." It was hoped that the human animal would yield a more abundant fleece. So, as their hearts were hardened, as Dr. Cornelius says, by a long practice of "noisome and infectious" experiments on animals, they had no scruple about purchasing their researches on human beings provided they could procure an adequate supply of material. And this, thanks to the complaisance of doctors in charge of hospitals intended for the relief of human suffering, was forthcoming to any required extent.

Experiments on Consumptives.

The "altogether erroneous conclusions" arrived at by those early vivisectors of men, Herophilus and Erasistratus, have not deterred our *fin de siècle* researchers from experimenting on a very extensive scale on human victims who had confided themselves to their care, or had entered the hospitals for the cure of their diseases or the alleviation of their sufferings.

Professor Koch, Berlin, who is "damned to everlasting fame" by his pretended remedy for tuberculosis, which killed many and cured none, gives an account in the *Deutsche Med. Wochenschrift* of November 13th, 1890, of the effects of tuberculin injections on healthy adults.

In the same periodical of February, 19th, 1911, we read that Professor Schreiber, of Königsberg, wishing to try the effects of tuberculin injections on new born children, was allowed by the director of the Midwifery Hospital of Königsberg to operate on 40 infants. He began with one decimilligram and continued to inject the tuberculin in ever increasing quantities, until he at last injected as much as 5 centigrammes, about 50

times as much as Koch said was the maximum dose for children of 3 to 5 years old. Schreiber says he had the kind permission of the chief of the Hospital, Professor Dohrn, to make his unjustifiable experiments on these infants, but he does not say that he asked for the consent of the mothers, but though he says that no immediate effects were observed from the injections, it is very unlikely that they should have no injurious influence on the future health of the subjects of this barbarous experiment.

Desiring to observe the effects of tuberculin injections on a child of a tuberculous family, Schreiber persuaded a labouring man to allow his little son, whose mother was suffering from pulmonary consumption, to be operated on. After the injection of one milligram, the boy was attacked by violent fever which lasted several days, with considerable swelling of a maxillary and a cervical gland. He also mentions that he injected tuberculin repeatedly into two healthy persons and that he observed an increase of temperature to 39° and 40° after each injection. Apart from the danger and cruelty of these experiments, their utter uselessness must strike every one.

Shocking Experiments on Women.

Experiments designed to ascertain the effects of inoculations of various virulent bacteria on women were conducted on a colossal scale. Dr. A. Doederlein, in a monograph, relates how he inoculated a young unmarried woman with the microbe of pus. This seems to have inspired Dr. Menge, Assistant Physician in the University Hospital for Women in Leipzig, with the idea of making similar inoculations on non-pregnant women. His experiments are recorded in the *Deutsche Med. Wochenschrift*, 1894, Nos. 46 to 48. His subjects were 35 women, who a fortnight previously had undergone the formidable operation of laparotomy (*i.e.*, cutting open the abdomen). His experiments on these poor women were 80 in number. The bacillus pyocyaneus (obtained from green pus) was used 23

times; the staphylococcus pyogenes aureus (from a suppurating breast) 30 times; the streptococcus pyogenes (from the lochial discharge of recently confined women suffering from puerperal fever, and from the purulent secretion of a woman who had died of peritonitis) 27 times. He says:—

“The bacteria I used in my eighty experiments on thirty-five different patients of the Royal Institute were taken either from diseased mammary glands; from the discharges of recently confined women suffering from puerperal fever; or from cultivations I had made from the pus in the abdominal cavity of a person who had died of peritonitis. All the bacteria planted were capable of taking root and flourishing.”

Experiments on New-born Children.

He also introduced into the bodies of new-born infants “a large number” of staphylococci. These experiments were made in order to see if the parts into which these virulent bacteria were introduced could expel them. Nature, more merciful than the doctor, saved these defenceless women and babes from the dreadful consequences of this virus violation—all except one who got an acute inflammation. He says:—

“My experiments on new-born babies (girls) disproved the correctness of the professor's deductions. Unfortunately I could get only three babies to experiment on. These I took immediately after birth. They were not bathed, but at once wrapped up in sterile linens and carried to my laboratory. I inoculated these subjects with very considerable quantities of staphylococci.”

Dr. B. Krönig (*ibid.*, No. 43) selected for his experiments of the same character 82 pregnant women. He employed the bacillus pyocyaneus, the staphylococcus pyogenes aureus, and the streptococcus pyogenes. Fortunately the results of all these useless experiments were negative, but the risk of infection with dangerous diseases was great, and no physician with any self-respect, any feeling of humanity, or any proper sense of his duty to the patients confided to his care, would have performed or allowed such hazardous experiments.

In the Royal University Ear Hospital in Halle (*Archiv. f. Ohrenheilk.*, vol. 27, p. 254), Dr. Schimmelbusch inoculated two boys with a pus culture taken from a boil on a girl's ear. The matter

was rubbed into the leg. Both boys were supposed to be dying with blood poisoning. On one boy, aged 10, first pustules and then a boil appeared. This boy died some weeks afterwards. The other boy, aged 18, on whom the inoculation developed 50 pustules next day, died 24 hours after the inoculation.

Dr. Jansen, of the Charity Hospital in Stockholm, reported as follows on the 12th May, 1891, in a lecture to the Medical Society at Stockholm :—

“ When I began my experiments with black smallpox pus, I should, perhaps, have chosen animals for the purpose. But the most fit subjects, calves, were obtainable only at considerable cost. There was, besides, the cost of their keep, so I concluded to make my experiments upon the children of the Foundlings’ Home, and obtained kind permission to do so from the head physician, Professor Medin.

“ I selected fourteen children, who were inoculated day after day. Afterward I discontinued them, and used calves. . . . I did not continue my experiments on calves long, once because I despaired of gaining my ends within a limited period, and again because the calves were so expensive. I intend, however, to go back to my experiments in the Foundling Asylum at some future time.”

The foregoing examples of experiments on human beings, though cruel, unjustifiable, and useless, were fortunately not attended with much apparent immediate injury to the health, but such is not the case with regard to the experiments I have now to mention. In these the operators knew very well that they were surreptitiously giving diseases of a peculiarly loathsome character to innocent and trusting men, women, and children.

Children fed on Excrement.

Dr. Epstein, Professor of Children’s Therapeutics in Prague, wishing to ascertain if round worms could be reared at will in the human intestines, experimented on five children ; one was 3 months old, another $1\frac{1}{2}$ years, three others of ages from $4\frac{1}{2}$ to 6 years. These children were all quite free from worms. They were fed upon a savoury mess consisting of excrement of a child suffering from round worms and containing many eggs of the worms, mixed with syrup. The result was that the children became infested with round worms,

and passed quantities of the eggs by stool. They were, after some months, dosed with santonin and castor oil. From one 22, and from another 79 full grown worms came away. It is not stated whether any worms came away from the other children, though their dejections were full of eggs. But as the professor says "it is much easier to get the worms in than to get them out," it would seem that the poor creatures were allowed to go out of the hospital still suffering from these health-destroying and dangerous parasites, wantonly introduced into their bodies by a professor of children's therapeutics. Of one of the children the professor says, "the child was evidently reduced," and indeed every medical man knows that these worms are often a cause of much suffering and ill-health, and cases of death caused by them have been recorded by Cobbold, Davaine, Blair, and Rogers.

Inoculated with Gonorrhœa.

Dr. Gross, Assistant Physician to the Imperial Rudolf Hospital, had under his care a young man who was admitted for an abscess on the left temple on the 5th of July, 1895. On the 25th of that month Dr. Gross communicated to him, by injection of its matter, a foul disease, which medical men will recognise when told that its microbe is called gonococcus. The victim, who had never suffered from any like malady, was assured by the operator that it would have no effect. But in 5 days he had the disease very severely, and it caused some serious inflammatory complications, viz. : epididymitis and cystitis, the gravity of which complications all medical men know. The poor fellow left the hospital in disgust and went to another hospital to be cured of the disease wantonly caused by the doctor. The same Dr. Gross relates in the third number of the fourth vol. of the *Archiv. für Dermatologie*, 24 cases where he injected the gonococcus poison into the arm, whereby the victims were rendered more or less seriously ill. Dr. C. Bumm, Professor of Gynæcology and Physician to the Midwifery Hospital of the

University of Basle, injected this gonococcus virus into an incurable paralytic, with the result that the defenceless cripple got the disease. (See C. Fraenkel, *Grundriss de Bacterienkunde*, 1890, p. 451.) He also communicated the disease in the same manner to a woman. (See *Real-Encyclopaedie der gesammten Heilkunde*, vol. 20, p. 137.) For this he deserved to be well kicked by every respectable doctor.

These cases are bad enough, but the worst of all are the following, with which I shall conclude this miserable record of medical depravity :—

Women Diseased with Syphilis.

Professor E. Finger, of Vienna (*Allg. Wiener med. Zeitg.*, Nos. 50 and 51), inoculated three healthy women, recently confined, with another infectious disease of a loathsome and shameful character. The first case was inoculated eight days after childbirth. The second case was inoculated five days after childbirth. The third case was inoculated ten days after confinement. These three unsuspecting women all took the disease in its characteristic virulence. They were all transferred to the department of the hospital devoted to this foul disease, as they were suffering from this disease artificially produced by an unscrupulous doctor. The first victim was kept there twelve weeks, the second four weeks, and the third five weeks. We can imagine the feelings of these poor and probably respectable women compelled to herd with diseased prostitutes during all that time for no fault of their own.

Professor Neisser inoculated eight healthy persons with the serum of the same disease, four of whom became affected with its unmistakable symptoms *Arch. f. Dermatologie, &c.*, vol. 44, p. 485, 1895.

These experiments have more than once occupied the attention of German legislators. The London *Chronicle* of March 7, 1900, contained a Reuter's telegram from Berlin as follows :—

“ In the Lower House of the Prussian Diet to-day, on the consideration of the Estimates of the Ministry of Public Worship, Herr von Pappenheim called attention to the experiments which

Professor Neisser, of Breslau, had made with certain serum on children and adults. *It had also been shown that similar experiments had been made by other universities.*

The Government Commissioner, in reply, said that on Dec. 13th last the Public Prosecutor decided to act, but it was subsequently found that, owing to the lapse of time since the commission of the offence, it had fallen under the statute of limitations. On January 16th the Government ordered the disciplinary examination of Professor Neisser.

The Minister of Public Worship, in reply, stated that so far as he was personally concerned he had no hesitation in declaring that he extremely regretted what had occurred. *He would give every guarantee that such cases should not recur,* and that a certain supervision should be exercised to that effect."

In the course of the debate Prof. Virchow said :
 "The serum-therapy is absolutely impossible without animal experiments. When a certain point in it is reached, it will be quite natural, and I cannot consider it a folly or wickedness or crime, if the experiments have been proved on animals, to try them on man (cries of dissent). Yes ! Gentlemen, it is the only way, and it is done continually."

Neisser's Brutal Experiments.

The *London Times* of Jan. 5th, 1901, publishes a telegraphic despatch "from our own Correspondent" as follows :—

"The Disciplinary Court for officials sentenced Professor Neisser, of the University of Breslau, last Saturday to receive a censure and to pay a fine of 300 marks for having published an account of certain experiments to which *he had subjected children who were patients in the University Hospital.* In an article published in 1899, Professor Neisser himself related that in 1892 he had made experiments upon children with the virus of syphilis, and he gave an account of the course of the cases. *Neither the parents of the children nor the little patients themselves were aware of what was being done.* The Disciplinary Court was unable to inflict a penalty for the experiments themselves, as the right to prosecute had lapsed through time; but it punished Professor Neisser for the account which he had published."

The *Medical Press and Circular* of March 29th, 1899, in commenting upon the matter, remarked, that in the inquiry "into the possibility immunising against syphilis, Neisser asked himself the question, whether the serum of syphilitic subjects was capable of communicating the disease to healthy persons." "Proceeding on the assumption that serum deprived of cellular elements is in most infectious diseases devoid of infectious properties, he made use of serums obtained

from syphilitic subjects, which he had proved to be sterile by preserving it for days and even weeks. With this serum he injected 8 girls, 5 by subcutaneous and three by intravenous injection. A girl belonging to the first series who had not meanwhile developed any symptom of the disease came to the hospital 3 years later suffering from cerebral syphilis. All 3 girls of the second group developed syphilis—one a month, another between 5 and 6 months, and the third a year after the inoculation."

Editorial Condemnation.

The Editorial continues : " It would be difficult to acquit Dr. Neisser of a large measure of responsibility in respect of the causation of syphilis in these cases."

" We, however, are less concerned in establishing the culpability of Dr. Neisser than in condemning the spirit which prompted such experiments. All measures, even if novel, which may reasonably be expected to assist in bringing about the recovery of the patient without injury to his health may legitimately be resorted to with the consent of the patient, but measures, whether by drugs or by operation, which have not for direct object the cure of the patient and which may prove inimical to his health or condition, are inadmissible under any circumstances and must expose the perpetrator to professional ostracism and to penal rebuke."*

The disease thus wilfully introduced into the bodies of these healthy persons, of course without their knowledge or consent, is often one of the most terrible affections to which humanity is liable. Its effects are frequently hereditary, extending to the third and fourth generation. It is usually contracted by the fault of its victim, so we may apply to the hereditary sufferers the words of the poet :

" *Delicta majorum immeritus lues ;* "

but it is sad and shameful to our profession to think

* Nevertheless Professor Neisser was invited by the West London Medico-Chirurgical Society to deliver the Cavendish Lecture on the Evolution of the Modern Treatment of Syphilis at Kensington Town Hall, London, on June 27th, 1911, and presented with the gold medal of the Society for " distinguished work in medical science."

that in apostrophising the offspring of the above sufferers from the criminal folly of these "scientific" researchers we should have to substitute "medicorum" for "majorum," for though innocent, they must suffer, not for the sins of their fathers, but for those of their fathers' or mothers' doctors.

I might add to the long list of "scientific" crimes I have given above many others nearly as bad, but I have no heart to dwell longer on this repulsive subject. It is some satisfaction to know that these records are taken from continental sources, and that British scientific researchers, though not guiltless of cruel experiments on brutes, and more or less addicted to testing new and powerful drugs on hospital patients, have not as yet perpetrated such crimes against humanity as are above exposed, and I do not believe that the medical profession of this land would regard with indifference, far less with approbation, experiments on human beings with the virus of diseases, even though they were calculated to be of use to the medical art, which the cases I have recorded above are not.

English Methods.

We would add that since the above article was written serum and vaccine therapy has become the fashionable craze in medical treatment in England, and it has been accompanied by many disasters and fatalities. So uncertain and unscientific are its methods, and so unsatisfactory are its results, that the whole system can be viewed in no other light than that of experimentation upon human beings.

Even the vivisection of criminals has been openly advocated in this country. Dr. Preston King, of Bath, wrote the "Lancet" of Sept. 30, 1905: "Think for a moment what this would mean. At present we are wandering in the dark, seeking vainly for the light that these experiments alone could give."

This is indeed the goal toward which experiments upon living animals must inevitably lead—exploitation of human beings.